UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/678,741 | 10/03/2003 Hassan Mostafavi | | VM 03-035-US | 6107 |
| 55499 Vista IP Law G | 7590 05/06/200 roup (Varian) | EXAMINER | | |
| 1885 Lundy Av San Jose, CA 9: | e, Suite 108 | RAMIREZ, JOHN FERNANDO | | |
| San Jose, CA 9. | 3131 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3737 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 05/06/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|--|--|
| 10/678,741 | MOSTAFAVI, HASSAN | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| JOHN F. RAMIREZ | 3737 | | |

| | | OCHIT : TO WITH CEE | 0707 |
|---|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DA | ATE of this communication appe | ears on the cover sheet with the d | correspondence address |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>04/15/09</u> | FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICA | ATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLO | WANCE. |
| application, applicant mapplication in condition | nust timely file one of the following i | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance | Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request within one of the following time |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | expiresmonths from the mailing | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
| no event, however, w | rill the statutory period for reply expire la | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing | in the final rejection, whichever is later. In g date of the final rejection. E FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO |
| | INAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f | | |
| have been filed is the date for pu under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculat set forth in (b) above, if checked. | urposes of determining the period of ext ted from: (1) the expiration date of the s | tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date. | 36(a) and the appropriate extension fee of the fee. The appropriate extension fee inally set in the final Office action; or (2) as the of the final rejection, even if timely filed, |
| | vas filed on . A brief in comp | liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be | filed within two months of the date of |
| filing the Notice of Appe | | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a |
| 3. The proposed amendr | ment(s) filed after a final rejection, b | out prior to the date of filing a brief, | will not be entered because |
| | ssues that would require further cor | | ΓE below); |
| ` ' = ' | sue of new matter (see NOTE belo | • | |
| | emed to place the application in bet | ter form for appeal by materially rec | ducing or simplifying the issues for |
| appeal; and/or | ditional claims without canceling a c | corresponding number of finally reig | acted claims |
| | (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | sorresponding number of finally reje | Soled Gairris. |
| | not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | 21 See attached Notice of Non-Co | mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324) |
| | overcome the following rejection(s): | | |
| | = - | | timely filed amendment canceling the |
| non-allowable claim(s). | | , | 3 |
| how the new or amende | I, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ed claims would be rejected is prov (s) is (or will be) as follows: | | l be entered and an explanation of |
| Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: no | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-32</u> , Claim(s) withdrawn fror | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVII | | | |
| 8. The affidavit or other every because applicant failed | vidence filed after a final action, but | | otice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered it or other evidence is necessary and |
| entered because the af | vidence filed after the date of filing of ffidavit or other evidence failed to o ufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fails to provide a |
| | evidence is entered. An explanatior | n of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attached. |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSID | | | |
| See Continuation She | | | n condition for allowance because: |
| 13. Other: | ormation <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (| (F10/35/06) Paper No(s) | |
| /BRIAN CASLER/ | | | |
| Supervisory Patent Exam | niner, Art Unit 3737 | | |
| | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

With respect to the 101 rejection, the new amendment to the claims overcomes the rejection and is withdrawn.

With respect to claims 1, 15 and 23, Applicant alleges that the Epstein reference does not teach the step of collecting data samples representative of a "motion" of an object, the examiner disagrees with applicant's assertions. Epstein teaches a method for prospectively gating and retrospectively sorting MR imaging data acquired during successive cardiac cycles. A cardiac cycle systolic period and a cardiac cycle diastolic period are determined for each cardiac cycle and the time stamp associated with the acquired MR data is correlated with a systolic cardiac phase or a diastolic cardiac phase. Images are reconstructed at specified cardiac phases using MR image data which is acquired during successive cardiac cycles and which is selected on the basis of its correlated cardiac phase. Cardiac phase is calculated using a model that compensates for "beat-to-beat heart rate changes" that accompanies respiration. (see abstract, col. 3, lines 45-57, col. 8, lines 47-62).

With respect to claims 30, 56 and 75, applicant alleges that the "motion is controllable by the patient". The examiner of record has found this limitation to be new matter. The original disclosure does not provide support for it. Therefore, Claims 30, 56 and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

However, the Epstein disclose that there is a common technique for acquiring cardiac MR images such as Prospectively gated, segmented k-space sequences in which images can be obtained in a breath-hold and therefore do not suffer from respiratory artifact (col. 3, lines 12-22).